

The Director of Central Intelligence
Washington, D.C. 20505

7 January 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR:
Arms Control Intelligence Staff

FROM: DCI

SUBJECT: Arms Control Treaty Violations -
Letter dated 4 January 1985 to
the President from Senate Budget
Committee

STAT

Is there anything particularly new on this
and what do you see is its significance?


William J. Casey

Attachment:
Above referred to letter



C-134

85-034

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

SENATORS:
ALAN CRUISE, IOWA
BRUCE ANDERSON, ILL.
STEFAN D. SIMMS, IOWA
CHARLES GRASSLEY, IOWA
ROBERT W. BASTEN, N.S.
DAN CLAY, MD.
BLAKE BORTON, WASH.

STEPHEN BELL, STAFF DIRECTOR
ELIZABETH TANNEBERRY, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

January 4, 1985

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As the new Congress convenes, we commend you for the two reports which you sent to the Senate last year detailing Soviet arms control treaty violations. The first of these, of course, was your report of January 23, 1984; the second was the report of the Presidential General Advisory Commission (the so-called GAC Report) which you transmitted on October 10, 1984. Between the two of these reports, you sent notice to Congress of 21 specific Soviet violations confirmed by the Administration.

Important as these two reports were, we nevertheless believe that there are at least 43 further Soviet SALT violations widely reported in the press which have yet to be confirmed by the Administration. These are detailed in an appendix to this letter. Since this would make a total of 64 Soviet violations, we believe that a review of all of the 43 violations ought to be included in your report to Congress which has been announced as forthcoming on February 1 if the meaning and spirit of current law is to be fulfilled.

Indeed, the necessity for a complete and authoritative review of all Soviet arms control violations was clearly underlined by the excellent letter of National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, dated November 30, 1984, on the status of further reporting on the Soviet SALT violations. It is gratifying that Mr. McFarlane quoted you as saying that we must take Soviet violations "very seriously" because they "call into question important security benefits from arms control and could create new security risks."

Although some have tried to minimize the importance of the GAC Report, Mr. McFarlane evidently does not. It is clear from his letter that the Administration considers both reports of equal authority. Indeed, Mr. McFarlane notes that both of these presidential reports "concluded that the Soviet Union has, in fact, violated a number of important arms control commitments."

DCI
EXEO
REG